

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD)	Amount Requested	\$ 6,891,010
------------------	---	-------------------------	--------------

Proposal Title	Dry Creek Flood Control Improvement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 13,782,021
-----------------------	---	----------------------------	---------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project consists of modifications to FMFCD's flood control facilities in the Big Dry Creek and Pup Creek watersheds. The project's primary goal is to provide better flood protection for the Cities of Fresno and Clovis, and surrounding areas. The project includes improving the structural integrity of the Big Dry Creek Dam, and channel improvements to allow more effective and flexible routing of flood waters at three points downstream of the Dam along the Dry Creek system. In addition, the project includes construction of one floodwater detention basin and expansion of an existing flood water detention basin in order to increase stormwater storage capacity, increase groundwater recharge, and improve groundwater quality. Other goals are enhancement of wildlife habitat, public outreach, and recreational opportunities.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	8/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	24/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	9/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			63

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough and well-presented documentation or sufficient rationale. The details of project elements for the flood control, water storage, and groundwater recharge benefits are well presented but the descriptions of the recreational opportunities, public outreach, and habitat and wildlife area elements are very vague. The Big Dry Creek Dam enhancements, Pup Creek Detention Basin, Dry Creek Detention Basin, and Dry Creek Extension Basin components are integrated and describe how they are related to the IRWM Plan.

BUDGET

The proposal includes detailed cost information but supporting documentation is lacking for key components of the budget. For example, construction costs are provided for each project component but no supporting information, such as engineer's estimates, is provided for lump sum construction costs. Generally, just stating that the estimates are based on prior experience with similar projects without providing some detail is not sufficient support for lump sums. In addition, there is no distinction between what the agency will pay for their cost share versus what DWR will pay.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation in February 2014. Summary schedule and detailed schedule are provided. The schedule indicates start dates, end dates, and milestones for each task and subtask contained in the work plan. Gantt charts are included with all the necessary tasks.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Although there is a table of performance measures and IRWM goals and objectives, there is no list of performance tools or methods, numerical or measurable targets, desired outcomes, or outcome/output indicators. For example, the Performance Measures Table targets "Reduce pollutants discharged into channels", but does not describe the pollutants or even pollutant classes (e.g. sediments, nutrients, etc.). Performance indicators state "results from stormwater quality monitoring program" but do not list what types of results e.g. numeric, percent reduction, or any baseline against which to compare program effectiveness. Under Measurement Tools and Methods "water quality tests at urban basins" is given with no information as to what types of tests would be utilized.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

This criterion is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits, but not fully supported by thorough documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. The applicant provided sufficient information for the Big Dry Creek Dam enhancements, Pup Creek Detention Basin, Dry Creek Detention Basin, and Dry Creek Extension Basin components. Claimed water quality benefits are mentioned and referred to in Appendix 7-5. The discussion of claimed habitat and wildlife improvement benefits was quantified. However more information is needed to understand how this benefit is observed and will be monitored. The flood risk reduction benefits Table 7-1 is in dollar amounts rather than acreage or other physical units, making it difficult to ascertain physical benefit.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Total project cost is \$14.5 million in Present Value. Total monetized benefits claimed in the proposal are \$67.4 million. The applicant did not use one of the standard tools like FRAM or HEC-FDA to estimate damages, but rather used a tool available on the www.floodsmart.gov website. The estimates provided are based on national average or representative values of damages to structures and contents for different sizes of structure and depth of inundation. The underlying data and calculations used by the website are not explained further. Some of the assumptions used to monetize damages are not justified.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant demonstrates a high degree of certainty that the proposal will achieve 3 program preferences and 6 statewide priorities. The proposal claims to achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region; 3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; 4) Drought Preparedness; 5) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; 6) Climate Change Response Actions; 7) Practice Integrated Flood Management; 8) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality; and 9) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.